

Minutes of the PUBLIC MEETING
of
THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP
(OHVAG)

of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD

May 20th, 2011, at the Red Rock Ranger District office,
8375 State Route 179, Sedona, AZ at 1:00 p.m.

AGENDA

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL – 1:06pm

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Members present: John Savino, David Moore, Don French, Rebecca Antle, (Pete Pfeifer and Hank Rogers arrived 1:15pm)

Staff present: Robert Baldwin, Doris Pulsifer, Jay Ziemann, Joy Hernbrode (AG), Tracey Westerhausen (Parks Board Chair arrived about 2pm)

1. OHVAG Chair (or designee) will read mission statements:

- a. The Statewide OHV Program Mission is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop educational programs that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.
- b. The OHV Ambassador Program is a partnership of agencies and volunteers dedicated to enhancing motorized recreation opportunities and management in Arizona.

C. REPORTS

Savino – Welcomed Parks Board Chair, Tracey Westerhausen (approx. 2pm)

1. **Update on State Parks Board Actions and Discussions on OHVAG Issues. – Jay Ziemann, Parks staff and Tracey Westerhausen, Parks Board Chair will review the Parks Board actions on the following items:**
 - a. **OHVAG recommends that one Arizona State Parks Board member be appointed to represent Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) interests.**
 - d. **OHVAG would like to purchase shirts, caps, business cards, or the like to identify themselves when they represent OHVAG/State Parks at public events or conducting business.**
 - e. **OHVAG members would like to be reimbursed for travel expenses.**

Savino – Read a prepared statement.

“Over the past few years since this executive staff leadership has come on board a communications barrier between OHVAG and State Parks Board has developed. This barrier is hindering communications and without ongoing genuine communication, the state’s off-highway vehicle program will never reach its full potential. This barrier I am describing is at the executive staff level. OHVAG has had issues that we’ve each felt very strongly about that were never presented to the Parks Board because staff disagreed with our opinion. We feel that staff has a responsibility to create an

environment of open, effective communication between all of its advisory committees. Unlike any of the other state parks advisory committees, your Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group has the ability to generate enormous amounts of revenue for both the off-highway vehicle community and your Arizona State Parks operating expenses, because of the percentages of these funds allotted to the State Parks for operating expenses which is estimated to be around \$900,000 per year, as stated by Director Bahl during your June 2010 Parks Board meeting. OHVAG feels that our concerns require immediate attention. The concerns we would like to discuss with you today are as follows – we would like to discuss each issue in full prior to moving on to the next, if possible:

1. OHVAG is requesting to set up a budget using a portion of the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund, no more than 2% as described in Senate Bill 1167 as funds to establish and off-highway vehicle program. It must be noted that these funds will in no way be taken from the State Parks \$900,000 OHV administrative costs. This account will be used for OHVAG member travel expenses, attendance at meetings, sending a representative to the State Parks Board meetings, travel expenses to presentations promoting the state sticker program at various OHV club meetings around the state, attendance at various OHV functions around the state. This fund will also include the expenses of purchasing various items that will be needed for presentations at these events. The estimated cost of this budget will be approximately \$35,000 per year which is less than 2% of the OHV funds. This amount is also considerably less than the amount of OHV funds being spent by State Parks on OHVAG's Ambassador Program."

Rogers – I would like to make it clear that that is your statement and does not necessarily reflect my opinion. If you had gathered all of our opinions, it would be a violation of the open meeting law. I do have concerns about the State Parks attitude toward OHV. I've been around for almost six years and I have never felt that State Parks wanted us. I don't think it's a good fit. I was hoping that with the passage of the sticker fund and a new director, things would get better. They have not met my expectation. I have concerns when we lose \$700,000 of our OHV funds every year to keep State Parks alive and I have expressed that to the people that make that happen. I think it is wrong that we have a fund with money that we are administering and we can't get reimbursed for our expenses. We paid the price to get legislation to fund our recreation. I spent six years going to meeting to get the legislation through. I want to see that good people have the opportunity to serve on OHVAG and good people may not have the resources to pay their own way to be on OHVAG. I think the stakes have been raised. OHV people are tired of being treated like second-rate citizens.

Pfeifer – I represent the American Motorcycle Association from Tucson. It's unfortunate that Hank (Rogers) and the others worked so hard to get legislation through and now can't get reimbursed for their service. What we are asking for is a small amount in comparison to what the Ambassador Program is spending. The Ambassador Program is a real feather-in-the-cap for Arizona, it is widely recognized nationally. Unfortunately, it is unknown in Tucson. With better promotion maybe we would have a program in Tucson. We are looking for some support for our efforts to better connect with our constituents.

Moore – The Group is not really capable of doing everything that it was envisioned to do. I joined because I thought I would be a liaison between the users and the benefits of their fees. The public has no idea of who we are or what is happening to their money. I

thought part of this job would be to get that information out and contact them at their events. The argument that OHVAG is not being reimbursed because none of the other advisory groups are does not make sense when none of the other group have creating their own funding source. The amount we are asking for is trivial in relation to the revenue generated and the investment in our travel and promotion of the fund would increase that revenue.

Savino – After I met with the Parks Board I discussed the issue with Jeff Gursh and Nick Seminetta and they went directly to Representative Weiers and he said the fund may be used to promotion the stickers. Our intent is to get out to the groups and encourage them to support the sticker program and tell them how that money is coming back to them.

Rogers – We think we are best qualified to market the sticker fund program, better than Game & Fish or State Parks. Increasing the revenue would benefit everyone.

Westerhausen – I understand your plea to use a small portion of the money you have worked hard to generate to cover your expenses for serving on this committee.

Ziemann – I sent a message to Jerry Weiers to see if that is actually possible and I'll see what response I get.

Rogers – If you don't like the term marketing, why don't we just call it education? That's what it is and that's in the statute. Educating the users about what the fund does also helps to make them more responsible.

Ziemann – Your principle responsibility today is to review the budget recommendations that are going to the Parks Board next month. They look to you for advise and you can change this budget proposal anyway you want. If you want to include these expenditures, it needs to be in the budget recommendation. If your recommendations do not agree with what the staff is recommending, you'll be invited to present your opinion to the Parks Board. The Parks Board has the authority to decide how the OHV Recreation Fund money will be spent. If the money is misspent, no one will come to you. I want this group to know what the process is.

Westerhausen – The Board agenda is announced sufficiently in advance of the Board meeting and you can comment once you see the proposals and certainly attend the meeting and comment.

- b. OHVAG took action at its August 8, 2010, meeting to fill a vacant position. Their recommendation was not presented to the Arizona State Parks Board until the November 17, 2010 meeting.**

Savino – Read a prepared statement on issue #2.

“At your May State Parks Board meeting the Parks Board directors voted on and approved a recommendation from Assistant Executive Director, Jay Ziemann, to have staff conduct a public solicitation to find qualified people interested in serving on the Board's advisory committees and approve these recommendation biannually. OHVAG applauds staff for revising this new member appointment procedure to include twice per year. However, OHVAG feels that if given the tools requested in issue #1, its members could reach out to the various off-highway vehicle organizations around the state and seek new members. OHVAG feels that we are better equipped to seek these new OHV members at the various OHV functions and organizational meetings. By

doing this State Parks would be saving desperately needed funds for its more important issues.”

Rogers – When I applied six years ago, I applied in November, was approved by OHVAG in January and the Parks Board in February. I don’t know why it should take so long to get people approved.

Ziemann – Four or five years ago the Board was getting routine business like appointing new members, approving grant extensions, grant requests for trails in January, OHV requests in February, and Land and Water grants in May. They were not able to focus on these items and still make the park operations decisions that they needed to. They felt like they were just rubber-stamping these routine items because they couldn’t grasp the minutia involved. So, the Board made a policy decision to address some of these issues at the same time once a year so that they could truly understand and become a part of the solutions. Grants were moved to September. Advisory Committees are addressed in November. Now, other committees are having vacancy and quorum issues, too. In response the Parks Board has agreed to consider this issue twice a year. Since we are behind the curve right now, we encourage anyone who is interested in serving on the committee complete the application and get it in by May 27th. We will hold a one-item telephonic OHVAG meeting in early June and recommend candidates for Parks Board consideration later in June. The appointed members will start serving immediately.

Savino – This issue I have is that State Parks is the one soliciting new members. This is a job that OHVAG should do. We have the connections with the users. If we were getting out to events more it would not be a problem finding good candidates.

Westerhausen – We are encouraging you to find candidates to apply for this process.

Savino – We found a candidate in February. Staff sent us an application for Jack Hickman. I investigated him to see that he truly had OHV interests, he came to our February meeting and was interviewed and approved by the Group. It is now May and where has this process gotten?

Ziemann – We have contacted Mr. Hickman and he does not need to reapply and if Rebecca can get her application in by May 27th, you will have two people to consider. Hopefully, you will have eight or ten. Whoever you select will go to the Parks Board on June 23rd. Staff does not make a recommendation.

Westerhausen – Because the committee operates under State Parks, we are obligated to put the information out to the public. We can’t just rely on word-of-mouth.

Pfeifer – Suggested that the process be considered quarterly.

Moore – Wants to see special circumstances like when there are unexpected vacancies. The Group operates more efficiently when it is fully staffed.

f. OHVAG expressed an interest in having an OHV website and asked what would be the best way to fund a statewide OHV website/webmaster and newspaper.

Savino read a prepared statement on issue #3.

“OHVAG expressed an interest in having an off-highway vehicle website and asked what would be the best method to find an off-highway vehicle website and fund it.

Staff is recommending the up to \$50,000 in OHV funds in fiscal year 2012 be used for a contract employee to enhance the OHV website with pertinent information and links. Exactly why is Executive Staff asking for \$50,000 of OHV funds instead of using \$50,000 out of the \$900,000 that State Parks is already getting from the OHV community for administrative funds? After all, wouldn't these be considered administrative costs? If the OHV community is required to use some of its own money for a website, then this program should be an OHVAG program with this group's members running it. We're all in favor of the website, we are questioning why it cannot be covered with the \$900,000."

Ziemann – This group asked State Parks to provide a website that people would go to for information on OHV issues. You did not feel that people would consider the State Parks website when they are looking for OHV information. We have an existing OHV website that contains a lot of information that is maintained with State Parks administrative funds. Your request is to provide more links, more information on projects and we're happy to host that and direct traffic there. What we don't have is someone who can go out and collect the information, get it in a form that can be easily loaded by our web person. That's what this recommendation does.

Rogers – I want to see an OHV person in this position. Someone with a passion for it, so that that passion is translated into that website.

Ziemann – I understand that and the person has to be able to put it in web language so that our web manager is not burdened with interpreting it. The information will include where the sticker money is going.

Savino – Our issue is that since State Parks do not have OHV facilities, and in California OHVs are strictly prohibited in the state parks, why would someone coming from California looking for a place to use their OHV ever consider looking under Arizona State Parks?

Ziemann – This person would purchase the domain names needed to direct people to the State Parks OHV website. The proposal for the position includes the responsibility to develop these connections.

Savino – We want to be assured that we will have input into that position and can tell our constituents that the money is being well spent. I can't respond to them when they ask what they are getting for the \$900,000.

Ziemann – The legislature has appropriated that money to State Parks to operate our parks. That is not a Board decision or anything you have input into.

Moore – I know someone who is in the business of doing what you want to do and would be happy to connect them with you.

Rogers – Let OHVAG interview that employee.

Savino – Will we have the ability to work directly with that person?

Ziemann – I believe that this discussion has satisfied all of the issues in C1. So while Tracey is here, I would suggest you discuss the budget issues.

NOTE: The following items were not specifically discussed.

- c. **OHVAG is involved in managing the OHV program that currently has two active funding sources that provide funds for administration of the program.**

Staff has been reduced in the OHV program area. OHVAG wants to know what is happening to the administration portion of the OHV Recreation Fund.

- g. OHVAG expressed concern that issues are not being presented to the Arizona State Parks Board or are being changed prior to their knowledge.**
 - h. OHVAG requests contact information for Parks Board members.**
 - i. OHVAG would prefer to have OHVAG funds spent in-house versus through the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).**
- 2. Chair's Report – The Chair will report on the circumstances surrounding the cancellation of the Whiplash off-road race typically held in the Showlow area.**

Savino – The president of Whiplash contacted me because after many years of operating their in the Showlow area on the Black Mesa Ranger District, the Apache-Sitgreaves FS out of the Supervisor's Office is requiring them to do surveys before they will approve their special use permit. I am bringing this up because I want this Group to discuss what the ramifications in this process might be to other groups trying to host events on the forest, like the Outlaw Jamboree in Eagar. Do we want to take a stance against environmental groups that are trying to shut down these events?

Rogers – I think we definitely need to support Whiplash. I was told they shut it down because the roads were not sufficient for the speed of the racers going through there. I don't know what road is when you're having a race. If it's been okay for the last 10+ years, what's the problem now? There is something else going on and that makes me very nervous for any events that have been using public lands.

Moore – I agree that all events on public lands are under attack. I think that since it is part of our responsibility we should take a stance. This race was celebrating it's 40th anniversary this year and it attracts upwards of 10,000 people.

Savino – They had 600 entries last year. That's just vehicles and drivers, not support crews and spectators.

Moore – Studies show that each entrance brings about 5.5 people to support them and then you add the spectators.

Rogers – I think State Parks Board, Game and Fish, ADOT, and State Land all need to write support letters to Whiplash to help protect our rights on public land.

Pfeifer – Our goal is to support responsible motorized recreation, so I agree we should support it.

Moore – That group is almost universally sticker fund riders. Those people have multiple vehicles and they should benefit from the use of the fund.

Savino – I have spoken to the Forest Supervisor and he suggested that some of us from OHVAG come talk to him about. I'm asking, if as long as we only take three or less people, is that something we can do?

Rogers – I'd like to suggest that we host a meeting in Showlow or Lakeside and invite him to that meeting and put this discussion on the agenda.

Antle – Can we get the particulars of why the permit was canceled?

Savino – I will put that on the agenda for our next meeting and have Jay McKinley from Whiplash come and discuss it.

Antle – I would like to have all of the information before we make a decision.

3. Staff Reports –

a. Update on status of Sticker Fund Projects.

Baldwin reviewed information provided in the packet page 9.

Antle – What do you know about the projects listed as zero percent complete?

Baldwin – Some of those have only been awarded recently. Not all projects were required to be completed in one year. The important thing is that we have identified and funded worthy projects that will be available to the public soon. Everything that has been initiated can be reported to the legislature in September.

Savino – We have set up a process where OHVAG members will report on projects in their area at our meetings.

Baldwin – We had to remove the “Subcommittee/Member Reports” item from the agenda because it was not specific enough on what was going to be reported. When OHVAG members visit a project and want to report on it, they need to inform me so that I can put that specific information on the agenda.

Pfeifer – I have been calling project sponsors to get updates on the status of their projects, then putting that information in a spreadsheet for project tracking. Can I email that information to the other OHVAG members?

Hernbrode – This is information that the Group may use in future discussions of those projects and needs to be available to the public. It should only be distributed as an agenda item at an OHVAG meeting. If information is relevant to something you have done or are going to do, it must be shared at a meeting.

French – How specific do items on the agenda need to be?

Hernbrode – It needs to be specific enough that someone from the public who has an interest in that project can know that it is being discussed and what will be discussed.

b. Update on the status of the expansion of the OHV Ambassador Program.

Baldwin – Reviewed the information provided on page 13 in the packet.

Savino – Questioned Baldwin on his authority to buy four trailers for the Ambassador Program. The Group only approved one \$25,000 expansion grant. We did not approve the use of the rest of the expansion grant money at your discretion.

Baldwin – When the grants were offered I was not aware that I could purchase trailers through a vendor on state contract and then loan them to the grantees. This process will provide a better trailer and maintain consistency in the product being used.

Savino – My issue is that this Group only approved the one \$25,000 Ambassador Program expansion grant. How did that lead to carte blanche use of the \$75,000?

Ziemann – This is headed toward one of the main issues of this meeting and that is approval of appropriation of the OHV fund money for FY2012. Last year the Parks Board appropriated money for projects and money for the Ambassador Program. They directed this group to select and award the project money to worthy on-the-ground

projects. The Ambassador Program money was divided between continued operation of the existing BLM program and expansion of the program to other groups that want it. The Parks Board has fiduciary responsibility for the OHV fund and purchasing the trailers at this time for the current participants and to be prepared for future needs was an appropriate use under their direction to expand the program.

Pfeifer – We all support the Ambassador Program. My concern is that we have not been kept up to date on the status and direction of the Ambassador Program. We had no knowledge of this trailer purchase. We need to improve the communication between this advisory board and staff.

Savino – I would like to table the discussion of the Ambassador Program until we have an opportunity to discuss some of the proposed budget items.

Ziemann – The update information about the program is in your packet and we are certainly not trying to keep you in the dark.

Rogers – Who are the other groups that will be using the four trailers?

Baldwin – In addition to the trailer for the Prescott group, the Red Rock Ranger District has a coordinator who is promoting the program. We are finalizing an agreement with the Coconino Rural Environment Corps who will coordinate the program in northern Arizona and the BLM group is expanding into the Tonto Basin/Globe area.

French – We only approved the two grants for Ambassador Program at our last meeting. Where are these other groups coming from?

Baldwin – The Ambassador Program has been on every agenda for the last year. In August the Statewide Coordinator and I made a presentation to the group and the forest service representatives in Flagstaff about our plans to expand the program and reach out to potential partners. That same presentation was made in November in Tucson. In February we discussed the expansion grants and at that time I told you about the pending agreement with CREC. We have informed you of everything that we are doing today except possibly that I would be purchasing trailers instead of including them in the grants.

Savino – OHVAG approves those expenditures. Staff does not approve them. Staff can only act after OHVAG has approved an action. You have jumped the gun. This is the first time that we are even aware that those organizations even exist.

Rogers – I do recall some of the other groups that have shown up. One in particular got my attention because they were more into other recreation than OHV, but I approved them.

c. Update on agreement documents that govern use of the OHV Recreation Funds awarded to the Community Forest Trust to operate the OHV Ambassador Program on the Prescott National Forest.

Baldwin – The information in the packet documents the processes State Parks uses to see that a grantee adheres to the terms of the grant regarding their operation of the OHV Ambassador Program. That includes an agreement with State Parks that identifies their responsibilities and references their application and the OHV Ambassador manual and a cooperative agreement they have with the forest service to accomplish the goals of the OHV Ambassador Program.

Savino – What is the status of the council that was developed to oversee the Ambassador Program?

Baldwin – An oversight council was established in the MOU signed by all of the sponsoring agencies and you (John Savino) were selected by OHVAG to represent them on the council. The council will be meeting soon to establish a charter/by-laws and get updated on the status and future plans for the program. The day-to-day operations are coordinated by the Statewide OHVA Coordinator, Chris Gammage, and his assistant Marge Dwyer. Participants in the program meet regularly to discuss the operation of the program. The Planning Team includes myself, Jimmy Simmons and Jim Harken from Game & Fish, Eric Norman and Tammy Pike from the Cave Creek RD, Cliff Myers the risk/safety manager for BLM and FS, and Tom Palmer representing the Prescott / CFT. This Planning Team coordinates training for the new units. The Prescott/CFT group received agency lead training on April 8th and the Ambassador volunteers were trained on May 14th. They will be doing events beginning June 11th.

Savino – How much OHV money are we spending toward these people, Chris Gammage, for all of this?

Baldwin – This is included in the \$110,000 that was appropriated to BLM for the Ambassador Program.

Savino – Is this program still in the interim/trial period? It was started in 2006, correct? How long does the pilot period last? When does it become a “permanent” program? How much longer can it continue without further approval from this group? Don’t get me wrong, I think it’s a wonderful program.

Hernbrode – There is no legal definition of a “pilot” program.

Ziemann – It was identified as a pilot program because it was something new. It has continued to get funded by the Parks Board because it has flowered and is highly successful. We are asking for your input on funding for next year and you can agree with what we suggest, change the amount, or vote to cancel it altogether. We will take your recommendation to the Parks Board and they will decide.

Savino – The \$110,000 that the Parks Board approved last year did not come in front of us. We had no knowledge of it. Yet, that is money that the OHV community is counting on us to govern. You guys went forward with it without our approval.

Baldwin – You voted on it last year at this time. It was on the agenda just like it is today.

Rogers – So what was the \$110,000 to BLM for? Are we paying them more money now?

Baldwin – The agreement approved last year is still in effect. The \$110,000 covers one fulltime employee and one part-time employee. It also covers the expenses for operating the events on BLM and Cave Creek RD. There was money added for expansion under BLM to other BLM or FS locations that they would coordinate. This budget recommendation is item C7 on your May 21, 2011 agenda and the itemization of costs is Attachment D.

Pfeifer – The grant to CFT was \$25,000. This report shows \$18,500. That was reduced by the cost for a trailer?

Baldwin – Correct.

d. Update on the State Parks Website Hits for OHV Pages.

NOTE: There was no discussion on this item.

D. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the February 25, 2011 OHVAG meeting.

Motion Antle, second French, carried unanimous

2. Consider Canceling the FY2011 Sticker Fund Projects for Cave Creek Ranger District. – These projects were approved at the May 21, 2010 OHVAG meeting with the understanding that the project sponsor would be able to complete them by June of 2011. To date the projects have not been started.

Savino read the staff report and motion.

Rogers moved, second French, carried unanimously.

3. Consider Staff Recommendations for Appropriation of FY2012 Off-Highway Vehicle Fund Revenue. – The Group will review the staff proposal and make a recommendation to the State Parks Board for allocation of the OHV Recreation Fund revenue available for FY2012.

a. Website Enhancements up to \$50,000.

Savino – We've pretty much discussed this issue.

Rogers – I would like staff to consider what they want to see and bring a proposal to us at the next meeting. I have some ideas and we could give staff our input on what should be included on the website.

Baldwin – I will certainly solicit your input to develop the job description before we put it out. Then when the person is hired we can have them sit down with this group to discuss your ideas on what the website should contain or how it should look.

OHVAG Recommendation – Funding for OHV Website Enhancements

I move to recommending up to \$50,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Fund be allocated to State Parks to use to contract a person who will gather and edit OHV information for inclusion on the State Parks website and disseminate important OHV information to the public and to used to purchase domain names and for other costs associated with website enhancements, and that this recommendation be forwarded to the State Parks Board for final action.

Savino read motion, Pfeifer moved, second Moore, carried unanimous.

Rogers – I have heartburn with the word edit.

b. OHV Ambassador Program up to \$330,100.

Rogers – What period are we talking about?

Ziemann – This is a proposal for state fiscal year 2012, July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. Last year the BLM received \$110,000 and \$75,000 was allocated to expand the program. This proposal increases the BLM amount to \$163,800. The expansion amount is increased to \$166,300.

French – It seems to me the program is taking on an identity of its' own. From what I've heard it's a good program, but it appears to be mushrooming. Can we bring this up at the next meeting?

Antle – I am not clear on what some of these expenditures are. What is \$1300 for recruitment and retention?

OHVAG Recommendation – OHVA Program

I move to recommend that \$163,800 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management to fund administration and operation of the Off-Highway Vehicle Ambassador program for fiscal year 2012, and that this recommendation be forwarded to the State Parks Board for final action.

I move to recommend that \$166,800 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund be allocated for grants, agreements, and State Parks projects to expand the Off-Highway Vehicle Ambassador program, and that this recommendation be forwarded to the State Parks Board for final action.

Savino read the motion and included that it be tabled until the August meeting, French moved, Pfeifer seconded,

After discussion below: Savino & French voted yea, Antle, Rogers, Moore, & Pfeifer voted no, motion failed.

Ziemann – The Parks Board is going to act on the OHV funds in June. They can act on a portion of it or may act in absence of your recommendation. Without their action, we don't have authority to continue the OHV programs.

Savino – Maybe I'm confused, but this is not the Parks operating budget. This is money outside of that. Why do they have to take action on this? How can they make... it's our money!

Ziemann – This is a portion of the OHV fund that has not been swept or allocated to State Parks for operations. This is the money that is to be used by the Parks Board according to the statute. It is apportioned to the Parks Board. They must answer to how it is spent. We can only expend the money as they direct and it has to be for those purposes. They are the ones who decide how to spend the money. You have agreed to recommend that they allow us to spend \$50,000 for the web enhancements. This is money that will be accruing beginning July 1st and we expect to have about \$1.4 million. If they do not direct us, we cannot spend it. They are relying on your advice, you are their experts. The staff recommendation is just to get the discussion going. If you're not comfortable making that recommendation, we can have them act on the \$50,000 that you are comfortable with and we'll get you more information for the August meeting and we'll put it on the Board agenda for September.

Savino – We are not against this project, we only received this information three days ago and \$330,000 is a lot to be putting out there.

Pfeifer – If we are presented with a project this big, we should get a presentation from BLM. Someone needs to assure us that the money is well spent, so we are comfortable approving it.

Ziemann – These requests represent the same categories that were funded last year except at higher amounts. Bob has consulted with the land manager to determine what is needed.

French – Since I'm new to the Group, maybe I don't understand how things are done. But, throughout the year projects are presented to us for review. Why do we have to get this approved all at once in advance?

Ziemann – Your understanding is not quite correct. Typically the grant process required that projects be submitted at a specific time for specific purposes to be approved by the Park Board once a year. Because of the nature of the OHV community and the political pressure on this fund, last year we asked the Parks Board to approve a broad authority for you select projects so we could get them going and on the ground. As long as the projects were meeting the requirements and priorities identified in the plan, they didn't go back to the Board. The same is true for the Ambassador Program. Based on their understanding of the program and the staff and OHVAG recommendation they authorized staff to spend the money as proposed. The Board is not aware of all of the projects that have been funded over the year, so that is part of what we report to them in response to their confidence in staff and OHVAG. This will encourage them to allow us to continue selecting projects and running the Ambassador program like we did this past year. This is why at this time we request that the Board authorize the money for FY2012.

Westerhausen – Don't the motions direct the Board to allow expenditures "up to" a certain amount?

Ziemann – That's the way I had it, but if they are not comfortable doing that, I don't have a problem with pulling it back and getting you more information so we can act on it in September. We will continue working on the projects that were authorized for FY2011. We can use the \$50,000 to get the web person going. I don't know what the impact would be to the Ambassador Program.

Savino – I'm not comfortable with that.

Rogers – I'm not comfortable either. I just see too many things in here that I question.

Pfeifer – I would like to say that Bob Baldwin does a fantastic job putting this stuff together. I know it is hard to present this in an easily digestible manner and I do appreciate his efforts.

Moore – Is there something that says it's all or nothing? I don't like the idea that they get hung up for a quarter of the year. Can we agree to match the FY2011 with the additional amount to be discussed?

Ziemann – You can make that recommendation and we would take that to the Board.

Antle – I think that's a good idea until we can find out what the rest of this is. It may all be fine, but we don't know that.

French – Are we putting in for four units?

Savino – That isn't right because if we go back to the old funding, it wouldn't bring up the issue of the four trailers. We agreed on the one trailer for the Prescott program last year, so if we go back to that it wouldn't include four trailers. I want to bring Tracey up to date on our earlier discussion regarding four Ambassador trailers. The Board approved \$75,000 for Ambassador expansion, three \$25,000 grants. We had three applicants and only ended up with one who got the \$25,000. State Parks staff decided that since they have money left over they would buy four trailers. They have sought

other groups to get involved in the Ambassador Program without coming back to us. We need to review these groups.

Ziemann – The trailers were purchased for use by other groups that may come onboard with the Ambassador Program....

Savino – I'm going to interrupt you again. This is getting contentious. Who gave you the authority to use our money to buy those other trailers? That's our money whether you say it goes to the Parks Board or not. They are responsible for it, Tracey didn't go out and buy those trailers. Executive staff bought those trailers. Who gave you the authority to do that? Who did?

Ziemann – There was money available, the purchase of trailers to expand the program was consistent with the Board's allocation of the money, and it was economical to purchase and wrap the trailer in bulk.

Pfeifer – We know your intentions were good, but we feel slighted that we were left out of that decision. Now that the money has been spent, we don't have seed money for any more clubs to apply for the program? So, we can still have two clubs put in for the grants?

Baldwin – I had an update on the Ambassador Program on the agenda for discussion before this funding issue was scheduled to come up. You did not allow me to complete that discussion. We have had the Ambassador Program on the agenda for every OHVAG meeting for the past year. The goal of the Ambassador Program is to get more people in more places talking to people about the stickers and new OHV regulation and promoting safe and responsible recreation. They are available to the land managers to show presence and help control OHV activities on their land. The grants were offered to groups who were interested in working with the agencies by coordinating the volunteer. We want to take the burden of volunteer coordination off of the agency. We found groups on the Prescott NF, in Flagstaff, and on the Tonto Basin and Globe Ranger Districts that want help. The BLM group will coordinate for them and they need a trailer. Flagstaff needs a trailer...

Savino – The issue is that you came to us when it was convenient. Now you come in saying that you have an agreement ready to sign with the group in Flagstaff. This is the first we've heard of this. What happened to the process of bringing it back to OHVAG? It's not up to you to make an agreement with that group or to buy a trailer for that group.

Baldwin – State Parks manages the Ambassador Program in cooperation with the partner agencies. When I have an interagency agreement in place, I can issue a work order under the authority that the Parks Board has given to expand the Ambassador Program. The Ambassador Program has operated under the authority of the Parks Board since it began. We offered grants to encourage the expansion. We also have the ability to enter into agreements. We are doing what it takes to get people out there. Our work order with CREC is within the terms of that agreement and the authority to operate the Ambassador Program.

French – Do you want to stand up in front of all of these people and tell them that you want a third of their money for this project? It's a good one...

Baldwin – You all keep saying what a good program it is and you are going to get more bang for your buck than you will with any dirt moving project.

Savino – I'm not sure we are and I want to at least have the ability to decide for myself if I am or not. I don't want it shoved down my throat.

Ziemann – It's not an either or situation. There is plenty of money for grants and for the Ambassador Program.

Savino – So is Bob lying when he sends us this email telling us we need to rate these projects because we may not have money to fund all of them.

Westerhausen – Nobody is lying. I just want to be clear that you are upset that you were not consulted on the use of the \$50,000 in grant funds that were not awarded.

Savino – That's correct.

Rogers – I like the Ambassador Program, but I don't want to spend this kind of money. I want to see our money spent on opening up more trails and providing more riding opportunities for people. The Ambassador Program is going farther than I want to see it go. It's not a bad program, it's an excellent program. I just want to see more of our money to opportunities for riding.

Savino – Why are we sending that much money to BLM? When the state is laying off people, why don't we keep this money and ask them to put on another hat?

Ziemann – That money is not ours to keep. The legislature appropriates money to run our agency. There is no money in that budget for an Ambassador coordinator. It's got to go to the purposes that the statute dictates. There is a state hiring freeze. We cannot hire fulltime staff.

Savino – All I can say is that the people I talk to don't like seeing the money go to BLM.

Baldwin – Explained what has happened to the \$75,000 allocated for expansion grants. The money went to the Community Forest Trust (\$18,500), purchase of four trailers and wraps (\$25,000), and a new agreement with Coconino Rural Environment Corps (\$31,500) to operate the Ambassador Program on the Coconino and Kaibab forests. Part of the non-BLM portion of the money requested for the Ambassador Program in FY2012 will be used to fund the balance (\$43,500) of the agreement with CREC. If you approve \$75,000 for expansion of the Ambassador Program in FY2012, it needs to be available for general expansion needs, not just grants.

Savino – Duly noted. We have already determined we are not going to approve the requested funds for the Ambassador Program.

French – Asked about the process that allows State Park to give money to some people without going through OHVAG.

Ziemann – Explained that State Parks has existing agreements with the forest service and BLM that allow us to work together on certain projects.

Pfeifer – Says he has never heard of CREC and asked what it takes for someone to volunteer as an Ambassador in Flagstaff.

Baldwin – Explained that Ambassadors do not have to be a member of a club. They volunteer for the statewide program and select the areas where they want to work. Then they are coordinated by whatever group is operating the program in those areas.

Pfeifer – I move to fund the Ambassador Program for FY2012 through the BLM in the amount of \$110,00 and that this recommendation be forwarded to the Parks Board for further action.

Antle seconded, passes unanimously

- c. Allocation of all other FY2012 revenue for projects as the funds become available.**

Savino read the motion, Rogers moved, Pfeifer seconded, passed unanimous

- 4. Prioritize Sticker Fund Project Selection Program Applications. – Ten projects are requesting funding from both the OHV Recreation Fund and the Recreational Trail Program. Project sponsors may answer questions about their project(s).**

Representatives for all of the projects gave a presentation to OHVAG.

Project A - Access A Ingress,Egress & Staging Area & Project B - Access A Revegetation & Signage – Kenneth Lamb, Land Department

Sandee McCullen – OHV users were very supportive of the project when it was first conceived. I was a great project. It's not anymore. The majority of people who use it now are "yahoos". They are not the organized people who do the responsible recreation. We have been suggesting for five years that this site needs to be closed. It's not manageable. It has been divided by a gravel pit so the remaining parts are small and inaccessible from the other part.

Moore – I have been out there and it is not a great OHV play area.

Rogers – This reference letter has Bill Nash's signature. Sandee, did he sign this?

McCullen – He says he did not.

Antle – I do not see any recommendation letters from groups and all of the people I have talked to say you'll just be feeding the cattle.

French – What are your plans for when the property might be developed?

Lamb – It is far enough out that with current market conditions, it will be quite a while before it is desirable. However, closing this will make it hard for the Land Department to justify making any trust land available for OHV use.

Savino – If I were a rancher, I'd sign it in a minute. You're planning to feed my cows. I contacted RideNow and Bill Nash does not support this project. Other signers as Becky and Sandee have pointed out do not support it. Five percent of the OHV money goes to State Land to allow us to ride across State Land, but if we stop to picnic, you want us to pay the permit fee. And you're asking us for close to \$1 million.

Lamb – Closing it leaves a bad impression of what happens when OHV recreation is allowed on trust land.

Savino – All of the input I have gathered suggests that the area be closed.

Jody Latimer – This area is uniquely managed by a coalition of your partners. The OHV statute does not allow us to use our 5% for management of this area.

Project C - OHV Law Enforcement Equipment – Micah White, AGFD

Savino – Game & Fish already gets OHV fund money.

White – That money is earmarked for the seven officers we are mandated to hire. These vehicles will be used by the wildlife managers.

Rogers – How much does it cost to put one of the law enforcement officers on the ground? I had a hard time with this when Jimmy Simmons first called me. But, as I look at it, it puts 10 more sets of eyes out there. I think G&F officers are the best law enforcement people I work with.

Harken - \$135,000 plus law enforcement academy if needed.

Antle – These will be used for the wildlife managers, not the OHV officers? This proposal asks for money for training. Who is that training for?

Harken – These will be use by anyone in the agency that needs them. The trainings are for tactical purposes for officers. We also provide training to other agency staff. And we are working to implement the new ROVA training for side-by-side operation.

French – I feel like we don't get significantly more money than Game & Fish, but they and the Land Department are coming to us. And after taking 12% of the money out for administration, then more for the Ambassador Program, there isn't much left for projects.

Rogers – Unlike the Ambassador Program who will be coming back every year, this is a one-time investment.

Moore – I have a general opposition to funding equipment for any law enforcement agencies. They have their own funding sources. Public encounters with law enforcement are not generally a positive thing and I don't think this is a good use for this money.

Project D - OHV Safety Video – Jim Harken, AGFD

McCullen – Why are you doing the same things that NOHVCC already does? Have you considered working with them.

Harken – We have contacted them and are consulting. This is going to be Arizona specific: Arizona laws, Arizona scenery.

Rogers – I'm very positive on this. I think you need to be very graphic to reach teenagers.

Antle – I'm hoping this will be very positive.

Savino – Will these be available for clubs to show.

Pfeifer – I would like to see more of a storyboard at this time. I'm hearing storybook stuff and blood and gore.

French – Does the OHV Recreation Fund get credited in the movie? YES

Project E - OHV Law Enforcement Equipment – ???, CCSO

Savino – Where on your vehicles do you plan to acknowledge the OHV program.

McCullen – Rock Art has OHV fund decals.

French – What equipment do you have in mind?

CCSO – Most of our stuff is Polaris. Part of the equipment will be a medical litter.

Project F - Coconino NF Kiosks – Mike Deckter, Lance Haubrick – Signage is the #1 need identified by visitors to the forest.

Pfeifer – Is the NEPA completed for this project?

Deckter – Yes.

Antle – Why are you using wood? I don't see support letters from motorized users. Will these signs be for motorized uses only?

Deckter – We have received concerns about putting up big metal signs in the forest. Others say if you put up wood, people can vandalize them. All of the people who see these signs will be in vehicles.

Savino – Why don't you have support letters from motorized groups? The Diablo Trust is not a motorized group.

Pfeifer – If the project is approved today, how soon before they will get the money?

Baldwin – Within a couple of months.

Project G - Coconino NF TMR Signing & Project I - Kaibab NF TMR Signing – Mike Deckter, Lance Haubrick

Thomas McArthur, Coconino Trail Riders – Will these signs identify the miles of single track?

Deckter – The signs will be on FS roads. No trails will be signed. This project is not related to the TMR.

Savino – The Center for Biological Diversity and Diablo Trust don't appear to be OHV groups.

Rogers – Why are we putting money into this when the TMR is not final. You'll be marking roads that will be closed. I am not in favor of supporting any Forest Service projects until their TMR is completed.

Micah White, AGFD – Any kind of signing is a help to everyone. The courts have said that if a reasonable person is not able to identify where they are, none of our citations are enforceable.

Haubrick / Deckter – We will not need to remove sign even if the road is closed or not designated. The may still be available to permittees or for administrative use and they still be identified so people know where they are.

Project H - Cinder Hills OHV Area Access Road / Improvements – Patrick McGervey, Flagstaff RD

Warren Williams, Coconino Trail Riders – Is that only on the east side of Hwy 89? YES

Sandee McCullen, OHV Coalition – Cinder Hills is one of the state's first recognized OHV areas and we need to do what we can to maintain it.

Project J - Downtown Trailhead – Tonya Forbrook, Town of Wickenburg

No discussion on tape.

Baldwin collated the ratings from all members:

PROJECT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Moore	9	10	7	3	8	4	6	2	5	1
Rogers	9	10	3	1	5	4	7	6	8	2
Pfeifer	9	8	5	10	4	2	7	3	6	1
Savino	10*	9*	6	2	4	5	7	3	8*	1
French	8	9	10	3	4	5	6	1	7	2
Antle	9	10	8	6	7	3	5	1	4	2
TOTAL	54	56	39	25	32	23	38	16	38	9

5. Consider Funding High Priority Sticker Fund Project Selection Program Projects. – The current status of the fund will be presented and OHVAG will recommend funding for selected projects.

NOTE: At this point the meeting was two hours past the scheduled completion time and the forest service staff said she had to leave and lock up the building. The funding recommendation was very rushed.

Savino – Recommend funding the five highest rated projects. NOTE: Further discussion determined that the group actually wanted to fund seven projects.

Pfeifer – I move to recommend funding for the seven highest rated projects, and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreements.

French seconded, Moore, Pfeifer, French, Antle voted yea, Rogers voted ney, motion passed

Rogers – I will not vote for any of the projects that involve TMR that is not completed.

6. Consider Selection of an OHVAG Logo. – Presentation by Jim Harken, Public Information Officer for Arizona Game & Fish Department. The Group may vote to select a logo to be used on business cards and other materials representing OHVAG and make a recommendation to the Parks Board.

NOTE: This item was not discussed. Group ran out of time.

E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – During the public meeting OHVAG may afford any person the opportunity to present statements relating to agenda items, with or without the opportunity to present them orally. Those wishing to address the Group must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. Each presentation will be given approximately five minutes if time permits. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or re-schedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.

Persons representing agency partners may address the Group on issues regarding OHV projects, the OHV Ambassador Program, or other agency matters.

NOTE: General Public comments were solicited during the discussion of the agenda items.

NOTE: Group did not have time to discuss the following items.

- F. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**
- G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS - OHVAG will meet on the following dates:**
 - 1. Date in June to be announced – telephonic meeting to consider applications for appointment to the OHVAG.**
 - 2. Friday, August 19, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. Location: Kingman, AZ**
 - 3. Saturday, August 20, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. – Field Trip in Hualapai Mountains area. Meeting site to be announced.**
 - 4. Friday, October 22, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. Location: Pima Motorsports Park, Tucson, AZ**
- H. ADJOURNMENT @ 6:45pm**

Moved ???, Pfeifer seconded